DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 452 CE 026 124

AUTHOR Gorin, Zeev
TITLE Three Structural Determinants of Participation of Women in the Labor Force: A Cross-National Analysis.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 24p.: Paper presented at the North Central Sociological Association Meetings (Cincinnati, OH, May, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cross Sectional Studies: *Employed Women: Employment: *Employment Level: *Employment Patterns: Equal Opportunities (Jobs): *Females: Income: *Labor Market: Managerial Occupations: National Surveys: *Socioeconomic Influences: Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

A natural study was conducted to determine the effects of division of labor (level of socio-economic development), dependency, and mode of production on participation of women in the labor force. Participation of women in the labor force was operationalized by two indicators: (1) women as percentage of the total number of wage earners and salaried employees; and (2) women as percentage of wage-earning and salaried managers, administrators, and executives. The results indicate that socio-economic development tends to push women into the labor force in general, but not into the positions high in the occupational hierarchy. The socialist mode of production has a positive effect both on the entrance of women into the salaried and wage-earning positions in general, and on their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions. Dependency exerts a negative effect on participation of women in both categories of the labor force, but it seems to obstruct the entrance of women into salaried and wage-earning employment in general more than their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions. (Author/LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CN003206

ED189452

THREE STRUCTURAL DETERMINANTS OF PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE: A CROSS-NATIONAL ANALYSIS *

Zeev Gorin
Department of Sociology
Bradley University
Peoria, Illinois

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Zeev Gorin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 026 124

* This paper was delivered at the North Central Sociological Association Meetings, May 1978, Cincinnati

ABSTRACT

THREE STRUCTURAL DETERMINANTS OF PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE: A CROSS-NATIONAL ANALYSIS

Zeev Gorin

In this paper we present the results of a study of the effects of division of labor (level of socio-economic development), dependency, and mode of production on participation of women in the labor force.

Participation of women in the labor force is operationalized by two indicators: 1. Women as percentage of the total number of wage earners and salaried employees, and 2. Women as percentage of wage earning and salaried managers, administrators, and executives.

This is a cross-national study, for a sample of about 60 societies. The statistical technique utilized is multiple regression.

The results indicate that socio-economic development tends to "push" women into the labor force in general, but not into the positions high in occupational hierarchy. The socialist mode of production has a positive effect both on the entrance of women into the salaried and wage earning positions in general, and on their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions. Dependency exerts a negative effect on participation of women in both categories of the labor force, but it seems to obstruct more the entrance of women into salaried and wage earning employment in general than their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions.

While the three independent variables are quite powerful in explaining variation across nations with regard to entrance of women into the wage earning and salaried labor force, they are significantly less useful in explaining the variation in the extent of entrance of women into positions high in the occupational hierarchy. Possibly other factors need to be identified if the latter variation is to be better understood.

AUG 2 5 1980

This paper presents a part of a larger study which examines and partially tests three major theories of social change - the Parsonian theory of evolution, dependency theory, and the Marxist theory of development.

Of the three theories two - the Marxist and the Parsonian - represent the two basic paradigms in the field of sociology. They have their roots in the two dominant and competing value systems which characterize our contemporary world, Marxism and Liberalism. The third theoretical framework, referred to as "dependency (or dependence) theory," is less comprehensive than the other two--its primary concern is mainly with the underdeveloped world.[1A] It explains the underdevelopment of poor countries as a consequence of their subordinate position in the world system.

Each of the three frameworks has a different central or "core" concept which describes society and its dynamics. For Parsons, this fundamental factor is social differentiation - by this he means subdivision of an institution, or a system, into new elements with different structures and functions.

For Marx, the main explanatory variable is the mode of production - the manner in which society organizes productive activity and the relationship of producers to the means of production.

In dependency theory the main causal factor is dependency - the extent to which a country is dependent on other countries, or its relative position of strength in the world system.

[1A] For the purpose at hand I am considering here dependency theory as a perspective distinct from that of the "world-economy" perspective, although the two are related.

Position of women in society constitutes a more or less explicit dependent variable in both the Parsonian and Marxist theory. According to Parsons, with increasing differentiation of society there is greater equality between the sexes. The Marxist theory postulates that establishment of socialism results in a betterment in the position of women in society.

Dependency theorists do not refer directly to the position of women in society. However, indirectly, the hypothesis that dependency brings about an inferior position of women might be derived from this theory.

Let us now demonstrate the existence of these hypotheses in the above theories and briefly discuss the mechanisms that are stated to link between the core independent variables of each theory and position of women in society.

Parsons does not deal explicitly with sex inequality from an evolutionary perspective.[1] Yet, in his limited treatment of this issue, one can discern both the recognition of the inferior position of women in society, and the expectation that it will improve with further modernization. Parsons stresses the discrimination against women in the occupational structure. This is one of special importance, since "In our society, ...occupational status has tremendous weight in the scale of prestige values...."[2]

---

[1] In The System of Modern Societies Parsons refers to women in three places only (p. 101, 108, and 114), and only marginally so. In his two essays on age, sex, and the kinship system written in the early 1940's where he deals more extensively with differences in sex roles, he applies a static analysis, furthermore, one limited to the contemporary United States.

[2] Parsons, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States," in Essays in Sociological Theory, 1963, The Free Press, p. 193

He notes the existence of sex discrimination in the educational system, which constitutes the main channel into the occupational structure.[3] Consequently, Parsons identifies participation in the labor force and a pattern of occupational careers similar to that of men as an important element in the emancipation of women.[4] He states that this is indeed occuring with advancement on the scale of modernity.[5]

Parsons implies that modernization brings about equalization of sex roles. He suggests that differential patterns of socialization according to sex show a tendency to diminish in the "urban upper middle classes."[6] Since in the Parsonian conception the values of the middle classes are the dominant values which spread throughout the entire society (either because of the "swelling" of the middle class and/or because the general value system is the one held by this class) one may deduce that this change indicates the future wave for the whole society. Modernization also eradicates differential socialization of girls in the area of chaperonage (girls used to be chaperoned, while boys did not.) In the United States the pattern of chaperonage for girls has been "rapidly declining not only in actual effectiveness but as an ideal pattern." In less developed countries (Latin America) "...this type of assymetry has been far more accentuated than in this country in the modern period."[7]

---

[3]Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States", in Essays in Sociological Theory, 1963, The Free Press, pp. 90-91

[4]Parsons,"The Kinship System..., op. cit., p. 190

[5]Parsons, The System of Modern Societies, p. 108

[6]Parsons, "The Kinship System..., op. cit., p. 190

[7]Parsons, "Age and Sex..., op. cit., p. 91

Parsons does not deal directly with the mechanisms which link increases in differentiation with increases in sex equality. Nevertheless, the rationale for the stated relationship may be deduced from his paradigm of evolutionary change. It is implied in Parsons that the processes intervening between differentiation and the dependent variables are the ones which solve the problem of integration, namely "inclusion" and "value generalization." The process of differentiation results in increased complexity, and thereby creates the need for coordination and integration of the newly differentiated elements, norms, and groups. Since social order according to Parsons is rooted in value concensus, this implies the emergence of values and norms that are more inclusive and universal. The latter, in turn, exert pressure for equalization and absorption of more and more categories of population previously excluded, or in position of inferiority in the community.

This interpretation is consistent with the idealistic nature of the Parsonian framework, in which factors like resources and economic productivity are less significant than values and norms.[8]

---

[8]Towards the end of Societies Parsons states his position in an explicit manner: "In the sense, and only that sense, of emphasizing the cybernetically highest elements in patterning action systems, I am a cultural determinist, rather than a social determinist....the emphasis in accounting for the main patterns and processes of change has been placed at the highest cybernetic level. This level is cultural rather than social and, within the cultural category, religious rather than secular. Within the social category, values and norms, especially legal norms, stand higher than political and economic interests." (pp. 113-114)

In the classical Marxist literature we find a rather extensive treatment of the position of women in society.[9] In this context, the work by Engels The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State is of primary importance.

Engels locates the first moment of women's oppression at the point of transition from communal to private property:

> The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex by the male.[10]

The oppression of women will disappear with the disappearance of private property. In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels state this in the following way:

> The bourgeois family [the institutional framework of women's oppression] will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital...For the rest, it is self-evident, that the aboiltion of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private.[11]

---

[9] In this paper I limit myself to the Marxist theory as represented by the classics. Here I refer to the writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin solely. I impose these boundaries for a number of reasons. Among the most important ones is manageability of the task. The last decade witnessed the emergence of a vast amount of literature dealing with sex inequality within the Marxist perspective. The theoretical positions within this literature vary significantly from each other and are still in a state of flux. A discussion that gives justice to these varying analyses and interpretations would take us beyond the scope of this paper, in which the Marxist theory of development is one of three theories examined and tested. Another reason, although fundamentally related to the one above, is that in my design I focus on the writings of one or two representatives of each theory.

[10] Engels, Frederick, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, 1902, Charles H. Kerr & Company, Chicago, p. 79

[11] Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto, pp. 28-29

Engels finds that the basic condition around which the changing relationship between the sexes has been built is the physical difference between male and female, i.e., their different capacities for various kinds of work. "The division of labor remained the same" - the activity of woman was always confined to domestic labor. This seems to have been the basis, according to Engels, of the permanent division of labor between females and males: "To procure the necessities of life had always been the business of the man; he produced and owned the means of doing so."[12] Although the physical differences between male and female have been important in determining a certain division of labor between the sexes, this division of labor, according to Engels, acquires different social content and different social significance for the relative position of woman versus man within different socio-economic formations. In the communistic household, which was composed of many couples and their children, this task of managing the household "was as much a public and socially necessary industry as the procuring of food by men." With changes in the socio-economic formation (emergence of private property) leading to the emergence of the patriarchal family, especially the single monogamous family, the meaning and significance of woman's relegation to the household changed radically:

> Household management lost its public character. It no longer concerned society. It became a <u>private service</u>; the wife became the head servant, excluded from all participation in social production.[13]

Thus, it would seem that there are two core factors in Engels' analysis, factors which in their interrelation explain the origins of the oppression of women and, at the same time, indicate the way out of this oppression. One factor (or, more correctly, condition) is, as stated before, the physical differentiation between the sexes. The other one

---

[12]Engels, <u>The Origin of the Family</u>, cited in <u>The Woman Question</u>, 1970, International Publishers, New York, p. 10

[13]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 39

is private property. The latter has been the source of the monogamous family, whose "express purpose," in turn, was:

> ...to produce children of undisputed paternity; such paternity is demanded because these children are later to come into their father's property as his natural heirs...As a rule, it is now only the man who can dissolve it, and put away his wife. The right to conjugal infidelity also remains secured to him, at any rate by custom.[14]

Engels condemns bourgeois marriage, and analyzes its faults, especially as an institution which oppresses women. He sees such marriage as being "conditioned by the class position of the parties and it is to that extent always a marriage of convenience." And marriage of convenience "turns often enough into crassest prostitution - sometimes of both parties, but more commonly of the woman, who only differs from the ordinary courtesan in that she does not let out her body on piece-work as wage-worker, but sells it once and for all into slavery." In proletarian marriage, in Engels' view, the foundation of typical monogamy is removed. There is no property to preserve and inherit - for which monogamy and male supremacy were established. Thus "sex-love" becomes the rule among the proletariat. Another force which eliminates the basis for male supremacy in the family is the increasing participation of women in the labor force outside the household:

> And now that large-scale industry has taken the wife out of the home into the labor market and into the factory, and made her often the bread-winner of the family, no basis for any kind of male supremacy is left in the proletarian household - except, perhaps, for something of the brutality towards women that has spread since the introduction of monogamy.[15]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 17

[15] Ibid., p. 37

But Engels sees this progress in class-society as containing certain contradictions. The new potential for liberation of the proletarian woman - through the participation in social production - is realized in capitalist society in a partial, distorted, and self-contradictory manner. There is a cost involved in taking advantage of the new possibility to participate in the labor force, namely, giving up the management of the domestic household. The two alternatives (participation in the labor force or managing the household) present in this society are exclusive and contradictory.[16]

Since the dissolution of the communistic primitive society (in conjunction with the emergence of private property) the exclusion of women from public production, an exclusion based on physiological differences, has been the base of male supremacy. With advance of capitalism, industrial production tends to render these physiological differences less and less relevant to the process of production. Whatever the differences in physique between males and females, in the new conditions they have lost significance for the process of production, and become obsolete as a basis for the social division of labor. Thus, a material basis for the exclusion of women from public production and their relegation to domestic labor tends to disappear. In fact, the new capitalist economy <u>demands</u> inclusion of women in public production - for "economic" and "technical" reasons. This inclusion allows additional and deeper exploitation of labor, and it rationalizes the process of production, since women can perform certain tasks more efficiently.[17]

---

[16] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 39

[17] Engels, <u>Conditions of the Working Class in England</u>, cited in <u>The Woman Question</u>, p. 31. See also Marx, <u>Capital</u>, Vol.I, cited in <u>The Woman Question</u>, p. 29.

The introduction of women into the process of public production contains within it the seeds and potential for their liberation for a number of reasons. On the most general level, the position of a person in the process of production is the source and basis of that person's standing in society. The exclusion of women from the public sphere, and their relegation to the domestic, personal sphere, has been the basis of their inferior position. Their participation in public production enhances their general standing and their potential social power.

Participation of women in public production disrupts the existing male dominated family structure (which oppresses all family members) and creates the basis for a more egalitarian form of family. As Marx puts it:

> ...modern industry, by assigning as it does an important part in the process of production, outside the domestic sphere, to women, to young persons, and to children of both sexes, creates a new economical foundation for a higher form of the family and of the relations between the sexes.[18]

The introduction of women into the public labor force potentially creates a constant encounter between the two sexes in a process of collective effort - a group dynamic that may contribute to solidarity, equality, and mutual enrichment.

> ...it is obvious that the fact of the collective working group being composed of individuals of both sexes and all ages, must necessarily, under suitable conditions, become a source of humane development....[19]

The independent income of the woman creates also the possibility for her to disregard the pecuniary considerations in her choice of a partner, and to be guided in her relationship only by what Engels calls "sex-love." The woman, having actually, or potentially, an independent economic base, is less inhibited in initiating a separation or a divorce.[20]

---

[18] Marx, Capital, Vol. II, cited in The Woman Question, p. 30

[19] Marx, Capital, Vol. I, cited in The Woman Question, p. 31

[20] Engels, Origin of the Family..., cited in The Woman Question, p. 37

Lenin stressed the obstacles to woman's liberation even after the major steps have been taken, and the "necessary conditions" for liberation have been created. Thus, after enumerating some measures taken by the young Soviet government to eradicate inequality between the sexes, he spelled out some of the difficulties:

> The Soviet government has completely abolished the source of bourgeois filth, repression and humiliation - divorce proceedings... We issued a decree abolishing the difference in the status of children born in wedlock, and also the various political disabilities...But it is not a matter of law...in the countryside it very frequently exists only on paper...Religious prejudices...The deepest source of religious prejudice is poverty and ignorance; it is with these evils that we must contend.[21]

Lenin seems to indicate that oppression of women can continue even after legal inequality of sexes, and private property as the material basis for that oppression have been removed.[22] Improvement in the position of women calls for special institutions to socialize domestic labor.

> You all know that even with the fullest equality, women are still in an actual position of inferiority because all housework is thrust upon them. Most of this housework is highly unproductive, most barbarous and most arduous, and it is performed by women. This labor is extremely petty and contains nothing that would in the slightest degree facilitate the development of women...the construction of socialist society will commence only when we, having achieved the complete equality of women, take up our new work together with women who have been emancipated from petty, stultifying, unproductive work.. We are establishing model institutions, dining rooms and creches, which will liberate women from housework...[22]

Lenin seems also to be fully aware of the fact that participation in the labor force in general would not make women and men socially equal. Women need to be represented in various occupations, including the more complex and skill-demanding positions - positions with responsibility and power. In light of this we can understand Lenin's demand for the entrance of women into positions of administration and management. To facilitate the achievement of this aim he advises disregard of political criteria in

---

[21] Lenin, "Women and Society," cited in The Woman Question, p. 37

[22] Lenin states: "This transition to liberation is a difficult one, for it is a matter of remolding the most deep-rooted, habitual, case-hardened and ossified"system" (it would be more true to say, "outrage and barbarism," and not "system"). Ibid., p. 46

[23] Ibid., p. 53

recruitment of women into these positions.[24]

Throughout these analyses we constantly encounter the characteristic leitmotiff that the progress of productive forces unleashed by capitalism creates the potential, the basis, the promise of social and human advancement (in this particular case - the liberation of women). Thus, when Marx speaks about modern industry assigning a part to women in the process of production outside the domestic sphere, he notes that this fact creates a "new economical foundation for a higher form of family and of the relations between the sexes." It is the foundation that is created, but not yet the new family and the new relations. In the above discussion of the importance of the new situation of collective cooperation in work between women and men (and children), Marx says that this interaction must necessarily, "under suitable conditions, become a source of humane development". The qualification "under suitable conditions, is significant. It is the potential that exists, but suitable conditions are needed. Engels states that "emancipation of woman will only be possible when...And only now has it become possible.." Thus, the potential, the necessary condition is there, but not yet the sufficient conditions. In still another passage Engels states that the introduction of women into public industry is only the first premise of liberation.

The liberation of women in Marxist analysis is not a purely voluntaristic act, willed by people independent of the socio-economic conditions. The potential for liberation had to await thousands of years of productive activity which, with the emergence of capitalism, brought about a certain level and form of productive forces. This level of development of productive forces enables women to regain the position of equality and fraternity which they had with man in the pre-class, primitive-communist society - this time to regain it on a richer, more meaningful level. But under the social relations of capitalism the realization of the potential for libera-

[24] Ibid., pp. 61-62

tion remains partial, distorted, double-edged and contradictory. Engels indicates this fact when he draws attention to the mutual exclusiveness of the role of woman as a participant in the labor force and as a mother or manager of the domestic household. Engels anticipated the now common realization that participation of women in the labor force may turn into a mixed blessing because it frequently means an increased work-load (the domestic-mother chores, plus the job in the labor force). Marx indicates that the introduction of women and children into the labor force under capitalism means also extending the "human material that forms the principal object of capital's exploiting power" and "at the same time raises the degree of exploitation." The "suitable conditions" under which collective work of women, men, and children becomes a source of humane development, according to Marx, do not exist under capitalism.

> ...in its spontaneously developed, brutal, capitalistic form, where the laborer exists for the process of production, and not the process of production for the laborer, that fact [participation of women and children in the labor force at the side of men] is a pestiferous source of corruption and slavery.[25]

The bourgeois form of family (via private property) is seen as closely interrelated with the lack of participation of women in the labor force. The material and normative structure of the bourgeois family is inconsistent with participation of women in the labor force, and constitutes an obstacle to full integration of women within it. In addition, private property, the core of the capitalist system, is an obstacle to woman's liberation because it hampers her integration into the labor force by keeping private and individualized the socialization of children. It also, as stated by Marx, represents a system which distorts the liberating potential of woman's participation in the labor force into super-exploitation. Marx and Engels supply us with a preview of the presently raging outcry against unequal pay to women, and against discrimination of women by keeping them in certain categories of work.

[25] Marx, Capital, Vol. I, cited in The Woman Question, p. 31

To reiterate, the potential of women's liberation exists in capitalism by opening industrial occupations and public production to women. Thus the foundation for a new kind of family and woman's liberation is created. But this potential can be realized only with a change in the mode of production, a change from capitalism to socialism.

The label "dependency theory" is associated with the work of a group of Latin American scholars which made its appearance in the 1960's (the more prominent among them are Theotonio Dos Santos, Fernando Cardoso, Enzo Faletto, Anibal Quijano, Osvaldo Sunkel).[26] Its intellectual roots are traced to the theory of imperialism, and the distinction between the two is in the degree of emphasis on different parts of the imperialist world system. While the theory of imperialism focuses on the dynamic of expansion inherent in the dominating countries, dependency theory focuses on the consequences of this domination for the subordinated countries. For this reason dependency is seen as complementary to the theory of imperialism.[27]

On the most general level, dependency theory postulates that underdevelopment and development are two aspects of the same process; that the underdeveloped and developed countries are integrally related to each other and that they constitute elements of one world system. The dynamic of this system produces rich, industrial countries, and poor, underdeveloped ones, simultaneously. The processes of development and underdevelopment occur together, and they interact and mutually reinforce each other.[28]

---

26 While dependency theory has originated in Latin America and was first applied to Latin American conditions, it was since applied to other countries as well. For example, it has been utilized to analyze the African countries by Amin, Arrighi, and Saul.

27 It is often stated that dependency theory provides the view from "below", while the theory of imperialism gives the view from "above". For example, see Bodenheimer, Susanne, "Dependency and Imperialism," in Fann, K.T., and Donald C. Hodges (eds.), Readings in U.S. Imperialism, 1971, Porter Sargent Publishers, Boston, p. 176, and Stallings, Barbara, Economic Dependency in Africa and Latin America, Comparative Political Series, Vol. 3, 1972, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, p. 5.

28 This conception stands out in its contrast to (and was developed partially as a critique of) the various modernization theories, which view development "as a moment in the continuous or discontinuous evolution of a society which is economically, politically and culturally isolated." O.Sunkel, cited in Stallings, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

The subordinate position of the underdeveloped countries results in stagnation or distorted development, in continuous poverty and misery for the majority of the world's population. It brings about an unequal exchange between the developed, industrial countries, and the poor ones, an unequal exchange which reflects itself in uneven development and in the continuously growing gap between these two categories of countries. Dependency "deepens and aggravates the fundamental problems of their peoples", it results in the limitation of "their technical and cultural capacity, as well as the moral and physical health of their people."[29] Dependency theory states that higher income inequality and lower levels of health, education, and welfare in the underdeveloped countries, in comparison to those in the developed ones, are due to the dependency of the former on the latter.

As stated before, one will not find in the dependency writings statements linking dependency with the position of women. However, statements like the ones cited above (dependency "deepens and aggravates the fundamental problems..") and generally the idea that the dependent countries exhibit the most exploitive and brutal characteristics of capitalism (or of the non-dependent countries, depending on the version of depencency theory), "invites" the hypothesis that dependency has a negative effect on the position of women (independent of other factors). I shall test this hypothesis, although there is little more I can say, at this stage, about this relationship and the intervening mechanisms.

The three core independent variables have been operationalized in the following manner.[30] For differentiation we utilize two indicators. One is an index which reflects both the number of sectors of economic activities and

---

29 Dos Santos, Theotonio, "The Structure of Dependence," in Fann and Hodges, op. cit., p. 225 and p. 227

30 No discussion of the operationalization of the independent variables is presented in this paper. Differentiation, dependency, and mode of production represent some of the most complex concepts in sociological theory, and are notorious for difficulties of operationalization. Considerations of space do not permit a reasonable treatment of the validity and reliability of these indicators. I do discuss these issues at length in my dissertation, Differentiation.

the degree of dispersion of the labor force among them (sectoral dispersion).[31] The second consists in the percentage of the labor force employed in agricultural occupations.

For dependency I also use two indicators. One consists in raw resources as percentage of total exports. The higher the percentage of raw resources in total exports, the more dependent the country. The other indicator consists in concentration of export commodities. It is computed by summing up the squares of the proportion of the total value of exports held by each export group. The larger the number of different goods exported by a country, and the more evenly distributed the value of exports among these different goods, the less concentrated the country's exports, and therefore the less dependent the country. This indicator, as the previous one, reflects also the extent of domination of exports by raw resources (the more diversified the exports, the lesser the preponderance of raw resources within it). It reflects also the extent of mono-cultivation, or rigid specialization of the productive structure of the country.

Mode of production is operationalized as a dichotomous variable. Countries where the means of production are, for the most part, in private hands are classified as of a capitalist mode of production, while those with socialized (nationalized) means of production are classified as of a socialist mode of production. Thus countries commonly labeled in the "West" as "communist" are classified as of a socialist mode of production,and all others are classified as capitalist. In our analysis the socialist countries are attached a value of 1, while the capitalist countries have a value of 0.

---

31 This index is based on the following formula: $1 - \left[\Sigma X^2 / (\Sigma X)^2\right]$

X represents the number of persons in each of the sectors of economic activity. The more numerous the sectoral categories, and the more even dispersion of the labor force among them, the higher this index (and the higher the differentiation of society).

My indicators of the dependent variable, namely position of women in society (or sex inequality) consists of statistics that reflect the differential distribution of women vis a vis men in the occupational structure. Such an operationalization captures only one dimension of this complex variable.[32] Unfortunately, data needed for operationalization of other possible dimensions of this variable are not available for more than a very limited number of countries. One of the indicators of the position of women consists in women as percentage of the total wage earning and salaried employees. The underlying assumption is that employment of women in the labor force outside the household (and different than self-employment) represents a liberating condition. This indicator may be of limited validity if women in salaried and wage earning jobs are relegated to the less creative, lower paying positions which carry less authority and responsibility. It may also lack validity if there is variability in these latter aspects across countries (controlling for the percentage of women in the wage earning and employee category). We can partially circumvent these problems by utilizing as an indicator of the position of women the extent to which women are represented in administrative and managerial positions. This indicator consists in women as percentage of wage earning and salaried managers, administrators, and executives.

Tables I and II summarize the results obtained by regressing the two indicators on the independent variables. In some of the regression equations we introduce, in addition to the three core independent variables, gross national product per capita. This index is frequently utilized as an indicator of level of socio-economic development. "Level of socio-economic development" constitutes a complex concept. It subsumes under it division of labor, wealth, technology, urbanization, etc. By introducing into the regression equations GNP/c in addition to our three core variables, we hope to disentangle differentiation from the other variables that are usually subsumed under the label of "level of socio-economic

32 Juliet Mitchell, for example, identifies four "key structures"--production, reproduction, sexuality, and socialization of children--as reflecting, in their combination, the position of women in society at any time. Women's Estate, 1972, Pantheon Books, New York, pp. 100-101.

development." I suggest that controlling for differentiation GNP/c will indicate the effect of the level of wealth. Analytically the two concepts are quite distinct. I also find that, empirically, while GNP/c and the indicators of differentiation are positively correlated, these correlations are not perhaps high enough to create problems of multicolinearity, although this danger is ever present.

Scrutinizing Table I (see appendix) we may observe that the indicators of differentiation (division of labor) tend to emerge with regression coefficients indicating a positive effect of this variable on participation of women in the labor force (as wage earners and salaried employees). Socialism also has a positive effect, and dependency has a negative effect on this variable. Wealth emerges with a positive direct effect.

Observing Table II (see Appendix) we may conclude that differentiation has no effect on entrance of women into the managerial, administrative, and executive positions, the socialist mode of production has a positive effect, and dependency has a negative effect on it. One may note however the rather small contribution to variance in many of the regression runs in this Table. This suggests that perhaps additional variables have to be considered if we are to gain better understanding of the determinants of women's participation in occupations ranking high in power and privilege.

Comparing the two tables we may conclude that differentiation seems to "push" women into the labor force, but not into the positions high in the occupational hierarchy, the more rewarding and power endowing ones.[33] The socialist mode of production has a positive effect on the entrance of women into the salaried and

---

[33] My interpretation regarding the effect of differentiation (and given the weaker effect of wealth on entrance of women into the higher positions than into the labor force in general) seems to be supported, indirectly, by findings of other researchers. Thus, for example, the longitudinal data supplied by Judith Blake indicate that from 1960 to 1970 the percentage of women in administrative, managerial, and executive positions (out of the total nonagricultural civilian labor force) has not changed (it has been around 2%), while for men it has increased from 5 to 8%. (From the data supplied it is hard to determine whether these figures pertain to a sample of developed countries, or to the U.S. only). Blake, Judith, "The Changing Status of Women in Developed Countries," The Human Population, 1974, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, p. 99 (pie chart).

wage positions in general, and on their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions. Dependency exerts a negative effect on participation of women in both categories of the labor force, but it seems to obstruct more the entrance of women into salaried and wage earning employment in general than their entrance into the managerial, executive, and administrative positions.

It is perhaps appropriate to reemphasize the limited validity of our indicators of position of women. The measures I have used reflect in fact the position of women in the labor force only, and therefore the results concerning the effects of the three variables should not be generalized to the position of women in society in general, unless further research supports such a generalization.[34]

Having found that each of the three core variables has, in general, the effects on the dependent variable as postulated by its respective theories, the next questions would be that of a theoretical synthesis. One possibility is to argue that since each one of the three theories is successful in identifying a force with explanatory power regarding the position of women in the labor force, it is appropriate to work toward a synthesis which combines the fruitful elements from each of the three theories.

Another possibility is to address the issue of synthesis by applying the principle of parsimony. It may be asked whether and how does each one of the three theories actually or potentially incorporate all the three core variables. In other words, it might be asked to which extent each one of the three theories may account, in a theoretically coherent manner for all our findings, and not just for those concerning the relationship of its core variable to the dependent one.

An endeavor to deal with the issue of synthesis in any of the above

---

[34] That significant advances of women in the labor force do not have to be accompanied by advances in other dimensions is well documented. See for example Mandel, William M., Soviet Women, Anchor Books, N Y. 1975

suggested manners would constitute a major theoretical task. It would also involve additional empirical work, not conducted here because of unavailability of sufficient data. Thus for example it would be important to investigate whether dependency and differentiation (division of labor) have the same effects within the capitalist and socialist societies (we have assumed in our analysis that they do). These are important questions for future analysis.

APPENDIX

TABLE I[35]

Dependent Variable - women as percentage of the total number of wage earners and salaried employees

091	084	094	267	036	034	N	R^2
.28		.17	-.31*			65	.30*
	-.41*	.15	-.21			69	.36*
.34*		.15		-.37*		58	.34*
	-.41*	.11		-.38*		63	.40*
.11		.19	-.12		.42*	65	.38*
	-.17	.18	-.13		.40*	69	.42*
.12		.17		-.25	.40*	58	.41*
	-.23	.12		-.37*	.25	63	.42*

091 sectoral dispersion
084 % in agr. occupations
094 socialist
267 raw res. as % of export
036 contr. of export commod.
034 GNP/c
N sample size
R^2 adjusted multiple R^2
* .05 level of significance

---

35 Each row represents a regression equation. The numbers at the top of each column identify the independent variable (indicator). The first five columns from the left present the standardized regression coefficients. The last two columns list the size of sample each equation is based on (sample size varies depending on the independent variables introduced into the equation, due to differential data availability), and the adjusted multiple R^2. Although we do not have random samples, and therefore cannot utilize probability theory to ascertain the level of significance of either the regression coefficients or the contribution to variance, asterisks indicate a .05 level of significance. The Table should be read in the following manner. The dependent variable is position of women operationalized by women as percentage of the total number of wage earners and salaried employees. In the first row we have introduced simultaneously into the regression equation differentiation (operationalized by sectoral dispersion), the mode of production, and dependency (operationalized by raw resources as percentage of total exports) as independent variables. We obtained a standardized regression coefficient of .28 for the indicator of differentiation, .17 for mode of production, and -.31 for the indicator of dependency. The sample size was 65, and the contribution to variance (multiple R^2) .30. The second row represents results obtained by introducing the same variables, the only difference being that one indicator of differentiation was substituted by another one (sectoral dispersion has been substituted by percentage of the labor force in agricultural occupations). The relatively large number of regression equations stems from the combinations due to the multiple indicators of several independent variables utilized in our analysis. The four last rows

TABLE II[36]

Dependent Variable - women as percentage of wage earning and salaried managers, administrators, and executives

091	084	094	267	036	034	N	R^2
.10		.10	-.21			47	.08
	-.09	.14	-.18			54	.06
.14		.30*		-.20		42	.16
	-.09	.30*		-.29*		50	.16
.00		.12	-.12		.23	47	.07
	.08	.15	-.15		.26	54	.08
-.02		.32*		-.08	.32	42	.19
	.05	.25		-.29*	.19	50	.16

36 For explanation of the Table and data sources see previous Table.

35, continued
present the results obtained by regressing the dependent variable on four independent variables - gross national product per capita has been introduced in addition to the three core variables. The data sources are: For the indicator of the dependent variable - International Labour Office, Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1972; for sectoral dispersion - Ibid.; for raw resources as percentage of total exports - United Nations, Yearbook of International Trade Statistics 1969, New York, 1971; for concentration of export commodities - Taylor, Charles L., and Hudson, Michael C. (collected under the direction of), World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators, 2nd edition, Ann Arbor: Inter-University Political Data Consortium, 1971; for GNP/c - Ibid.